DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 327 HE 012 057

AUTHOR	Linney, Thomas
TITLE	Interstate Migration of College Students. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Currents, December 1979.
INSTITUTION	American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.: George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Dec 79
NOTE	5p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications Department, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, DC 20036 ($.40)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Access to Education: College Attendance: *College Choice: College Cooperation: Federal Aid: Geographic Distribution: Higher Education: *Migration Patterns: Regional Cooperation: *Residence Requirements: State Aid: State Colleges: Student Characteristics: *Student Financial Aid: Tuition
IDENTIFIERS	Information Analysis Products: *In State Students: *Out of State Students

ABSTRACT

The current trends in college student migration and implications for higher education are discussed. Declining trends in interstate migration are rapidly limiting institutional diversity by increasing the homogeneity of student bodies. Diversity of experience and education has been noted as fostering and strengthening individual, institutional, and societal goals for higher education. Some data on migration trends are presented. A student eligible for state aid is probably less likely to attend an out-of-state institution unless the available aid is probable. Unlike most federal programs, only seven states and the District of Columbia presently allow the use of state student aid program funds to be portable. Until more portability exists in state student aid programs, the present trend toward home-state attendance will continue. Issues that support existing trends in migration are: (1) tuition and fees for out-of-state residents continue to rise at rates faster than those for state residents; (2) state student financial aid programs continue to expand, supported with federal matching funds, though these still tend to be limited to state residents; and (3) federal programs support access and choice while state programs provide access for state residents with less concern for opportunities beyond state borders. Reciprocal tuition agreements between states, student exchange programs coordinated by regional state compacts, and applications of marketing approaches to student recruitment are examples of interstate policies concerning migration. (SW)

RESEARCH CURRENTS

December 1979
AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED180327

INTERSTATE MIGRATION OF COLLEGE STUDENTS

By Thomas Linney

"Ten years ago this college had 60 students from Ohio and 4 from Lake Forest; now those numbers have reversed. This college has gone from being a midwestern college with some local enrollment to an Illinois college with predominantly home state enrollment and only a scattering of enrollment from other states."

Ted Marchese
Director of Institutional Research
Barat College

Introduction

Quietly, without fanfare or extensive documentation, enrollment patterns among colleges and universities are shifting. The overall trend in college enrollment is slowly moving toward attendance at home-state institutions by the vast majority of college students. This paper will discuss the current trends in college student migration and the implications it has for higher education.

Student migration in the United States has been declining since the end of World War II (California Coordinating Council for Higher Education 1970; Steahr and Schmid 1972). Few objections have been raised to this continuing trend. Yet as of social problems, increasing responsiveness of government and social institutions, and greater understanding of social responsibility. Carbone (1973, 1974) describes individual goals of enlarged and enhanced personal horizons; institutional goals of greater diversity that attracts more interesting faculty and students and thereby promotes institutional growth; and societal goals of providing trained individuals in professional and technical fields to meet national needs. All such goals are promoted through interstate migration. Carbone (1974) also notes the unfortunate relationship between increased fees for nonresidents and the continued declines in interstate migration. If present trends continue geographic diversity among students will occur only in the most selective institutions among the more wealthy individuals and social classes of this society. Etzioni (1974) describes increasing campus homogeneity as a development undesirable to both individuals and the society, yet as this paper will discuss, increasing homogeneity among students is exactly the trend discernable through an examination of the data on interstate student migration.

Current Data and Trends in Migration

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) uses a series of terms to discuss student migration in the United States. A student's migration status is determined by first determining a student's home state. In the case of a first-time undergraduate enrollment the home state is determined by where a student completed secondary education. In the case of undergraduate transfer students or postbaccalaureate students, the home state is determined by the location of the last attended postsecondary institution. Foreign students, defined

Carbone (1973) observes, the United States is almost the only nation in the world to restrict student enrollment at public colleges through residency requirement and differential tuition at state supported institutions. This legacy reflects state responsibility for higher education and until recently the lack of federal involvement in direct support of higher education. Fewer migrating students also reflect the majority enrollment position of the public colleges. Inexpensive, public, postsecondary institutions enroll 78 percent of the nation's students (Dearman and Plisko, 1979) and the growth of such public institutions provides a central explanation for the decline in student migration.

Access and diversity are key attributes of higher education in the United States. Declining trends in interstate migration are rapidly limiting institutional diversity by increasing the homogeneity of student bodies. While "home" state attendance may be good for the student's budget, it may not serve equally well for state and national societal goals for higher education. Bowen (1977) describes a continuing dichotomy between individual goals and societal goals for higher education and lists a number of societal benefits that flow from higher education. Chief among these are greater understanding

Research Currents is prepared by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C. The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the American Association for Higher Education for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinion, however, do not necessarily represent the official view of opinions of either AAHE or the National Institute of Education.

Copies of Research Currents may be ordered for 40¢ each from the Publications Department, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D.C. 20036. Payment must accompany all orders under $15.

HE 012 057

as persons whose permanent home residence is outside the aggregate United States, are considered separately in NCES data. These definitions are considered inadequate by most researchers who work in this area. Each state has its own legal definition of residency[1] that applies in determining in- and out-of-state tuitions and fee structures (Fife 1976).

For research purposes the definition of migrating students is difficult to establish, especially given increased enrollments of transfer students, and those from nontraditional age groups. As in other areas of measurement concerning higher education, exact numbers are nearly impossible to find; because of the difficulties in gathering national data from diverse sources, working definitions in this area must suffice until further refinements and agreements of terms are uniformly recognized. The following table summarizes NCES data on "Home" state attendance for the years migration surveys were conducted.

Percentage of Students Attending College in "Home" States, Aggregate United States, All Institutions

Year	Percentage
1958	81%
1963	81%
1968	83%
1975	85%

Source: Peterson and Smith, *Migration of College Students*, NCES 1976; Wade, *Residence and Migration of College Students*, NCES 1970.

NCES acknowledges several difficulties in the concept of student residence as this data was being compiled from the

[1]For a summary of all current residency requirements and the criteria established to meet them, along with recent relevant legal actions in this area, see *Higher Education and the States* Vol. 6, No. 3, published by the Education Commission of the States.

Thomas Linney is a Research Associate at the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.

2/a

1975 survey. Comparability with previous years' surveys, especially with those parts concerning actual residence, is considered marginal. NCES is planning to revise its definitions prior to their next 1979-80 migration survey.

These percentages of attendance vary with institutional types. Public institutions in 1975 enrolled 90-percent resident students, while private institutions enroll only 67 percent. Among levels of institutions, community colleges and other two-year institutions enrolled 90-percent resident students, four-year colleges enroll 8_ percent; and universities enroll 79 percent. Variations in level of study also yield variations in resident attendance. Aggregate undergraduate enrollment was 85-percent resident students, while graduate student enrollment was 80 percent. First professional resident-student enrollment was 67 percent reflecting the variations in the available professional-study opportunities from state to state (Peterson and Smith 1976). Here again there are limitations to the most recent data. NCES in 1970 reported two-year institutions with 95 percent overall residency attendance. No explanation is offered for the apparent dropoff save for noting incomparabilities with earlier data.

By its nature, the information on interstate migration is fragmented and difficult to compare from institution to institution or state to state. Some additional research and analysis has been undertaken in connection with federal policy initiatives in the area of student financial aid (Education Commission of the States 1977a, 1977b, and forthcoming).

Looking at migration data on a state-by-state basis yields information on both states with the largest numbers of in- and out-migration of students and also the net-migration ratio. A net-migration ratio is calculated by subtracting the number of students leaving a state to attend college from the number of nonresidents attending college in the state. The ratio is a negative number if a state is a net exporting state and a positive number if a state is an importing state (ECS, forthcoming). The ten states with the largest ratio of net student gains and losses are shown in the table below.

Implications of Migration Data Trends

This data on student migration has several implications. While numerically linkages between migration patterns and student financial aid programs have yet to be developed, it is almost certain that Federal and state initiatives increasing the number, variety, and availability of aid programs has had an effect on migration patterns. A student eligible for state aid is probably less likely to attend an out-of-state institution unless the available aid is portable. Federal funds have no restrictions on where they are used and funds from the programs that directly aid students, such as the Basic Education Opportunity Grant (BEOG) program, which can be used in any state at any kind of institution. Coupled with other federally funded programs, the institutionally administered Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (SEOG) program and the state matching funds, State Student Incentive Grant (SSIG) program, a federal strategy exists to promote both access and choice in postsecondary opportunities for students.

Along with federally supported student aid programs there has been an increase in state funded student aid programs in the last decade. In academic year 1969-70 there were nineteen states that offered need-based under-graduate scholarship or grant programs that reached some 470,000 students with a total of some $199 million dollars awarded in such programs. By academic year 1977-78, all 50 states plus six territories offered such programs, reaching some 1,190,300 students with a total of $746 million dollars awarded (National Association of State Scholarship and Grant Programs (NASSGP) 1978). Overall significance of the expansion in state and federal financial aid programs should not be underestimated, for this growth is the concrete expression of the national commitment to the goal of equal opportunity in choice and access to postsecondary education (ECS 1977a).

Unlike most federal programs, only seven states and the District of Columbia presently allow the use of state student-aid program funds to be portable, that is, used for educational

tive number if a state is an importing state (ECS, forthcoming). The ten states with the largest ratio of net student gains and losses are shown in the table below.

Top Ten States in Net Migration Ratio Showing Student Gains and Losses

States	Percentage Loss	State	Percentage Gain
New Jersey	(33.1)	District of Columbia	51.9
Alaska	(26.6)	Vermont	24.7
Connecticut	(19.3)	Utah	24.5
Minnesota	(9.3)	Arizona	21.1
North Dakota	(9.1)	New Hampshire	13.5
Maryland	(8.6)	Colorado	12.9
New Mexico	(5.8)	Rhode Island	12.0
New York	(5.8)	California	9.5
Pennsylvania	(5.6)	Massachusetts	8.9
Illinois	(5.3)	North Carolina	7.5
		Tennessee	7.5

Source: ECS forthcoming; Peterson and Smith, *Migration of College Students*, NCES, 1976.

While this study is not specifically concerned with the relationship between migration and population shifts, there are a variety of research studies that do consider these issues including Henderson (1977), Henderson and Plummer (1978), and Bureau of the Census (1979). Among the most interesting information emerging from these studies are indications of the shifts in population patterns as related to enrollment projections. Henderson (1977) projects nine states (Arkansas, Connecticut, Illinois, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio and Pennsylvania) will show a net decline in college age students in the years preceeding 1985, while six states (Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Idaho and Utah) are expected to increase college enrollments.

Since seven of the nine states projected to show declines in college age students are among the states with high net migrations, this could mean still fewer student migrations and continued enlargement of resident attendance trends.

District of Columbia presently allow the use of state student-aid program funds to be portable, that is, used for educational expenses at out-of-state institutions. This represents only 3 percent of these funds, 2 percent at the present time (ECS 1977b).

Portability of all forms of financial aid will not develop automatically. Until more portability exists in state student-aid programs, the present trend toward home-state attendance will continue. Student migration will continue to decrease. Access as a goal will continue to be served by public colleges and state-aid programs, even if student choice suffers. State support for state residency postsecondary attendance will continue to justify public expenditure of state funds for higher education, while fees for nonresidents can be expected to grow as states continue to put residency and local-taxpayer benefits ahead of policies designed to produce more interstate migration.

The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) reports that a thirteen-year trend in median charges for undergraduate tuition and fees has residence tuition and fees increasing by 128 percent since the 1965-66 academic year, while nonresidence tuition and fees during the same time have increased by 136 percent (NASULGC 1978). For these same years and categories the median dollar amount for residents has increased from $311 to $708, while nonresidents have seen tuition and fees rise from a median of $734.00 in 1965-66 to $1,733 in 1978-79. Taken in concert with the migration data, the implications of continually more rapid increases in nonresident tuition and fees would appear to be a continuing decrease in the number of students seeking to attend public institutions outside their home states.

Emerging Issues in Interstate Migration of Students

As the next decade begins, a series of cumulative issues point toward increased awareness of student migration patterns and their increased importance as a matter of particular

concern to higher education administrators. There are issues that support existing trends in migration:

- Tuition and fees for out-of-state residents continue to rise at rates faster than those for state residents.
- State Student Financial Aid programs continue to expand, supported with federal matching funds, though these still tend to be limited to state residents.
- Federal and state goals for financial aid programs are not the same. Federal programs support access and choice while state programs provide access for state residents with less concern for overall opportunities in postsecondary education, especially those beyond state borders.

There are issues that suggest some reversal of existing trends:

- Several states are planning or experimenting with differential pricing of nonresident tuition as a means of attracting new students.
- Increased competition for students can be expected at many institutions, especially regional public institutions and the least selective independent colleges (Millard 1979).

As colleges and the higher education community enter a period when enrollments are expected to decline, the question of whether economic pressures will encourage or discourage more interstate cooperation takes on increasing importance. Jacobson (1979) reports that there are developing signs of a new era of competition between states for student enrollment. This era comes after the development in the early seventies of a series of interstate agreements to promote cooperation among neighboring states for the purpose of making efficient use of each state's resources. Advocates of interstate cooperation have made arguments in support of such arrangements to help states avoid needless duplication and to promote, through sharing, efficient use of resources.

A variety of such programs exists. They tend to fall into two major types. One type of program is a reciprocal tuition agreement between states that allows students in one state

Applications of marketing approaches to student recruitment provide another example of interstate policies concerning migration. Three states are experimenting or planning experiments with differential pricing of nonresidential tuition as a means of attracting neighboring state residents to particular institutions within a state. The most direct evidence of such practices is the plan announced by the Regents of the University of Wisconsin to lower nonresident tuitions at the University of Wisconsin-Platteville by nearly $1,000 per year in a two-year experiment to attract more students from nearby areas of Illinois and Iowa (Margarrell 1978). Murray State University in Kentucky also has adopted a plan to waive out-of-state residence fees for certain neighbornig counties in Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, and Tennessee. Students must agree to live on-campus. Campus officials note that after major increases in nonresident fees occurred in 1968, nonresident enrollment dropped by nearly 50 percent; the county-specific fee waiver is an attempt to restore nonresident enrollment to previous levels (Mathis 1972; Jacobson 1979). The University of Nebraska at Omaha has drawn-up a similar proposal to offer reduced nonresident tuitions to residents of neighboring Council Bluffs, Iowa, just across the Missouri River. Regents of the University of Nebraska have yet to approve the plan, but representatives from the Omaha campus continue to support the idea. Unifying themes in these plans are the specificity of the target student populations, and the campuses involved. Expansion of such targeted plans may be expected if they prove successful. Those states expected to lose enrollments might be one place where experiments in varying the cost of tuition and fees and more flexible student aid programs might be carried out, with the objective of encouraging attendance in the face of projected enrollment declines that also overlap with migration patterns for the general population. At least some of these states already participate in the programs that exist to encourage enrollment from out-of-state residents.

out paying nonresident tuition. The state of Minnesota has such reciprocal arrangements with Wisconsin, North Dakota, and South Dakota and with selected private institutions in northern Iowa (Laird 1974; MacDonald 1977; Patrick 1977; ECS forthcoming). In these states a direct payment is made at year's end from state to state covering the net differences between the cost of education and the tuition paid by students who migrate between states.

A second major type of cooperative arrangement is the student exchange program coordinated by regional state compacts. Examples of these regional state compacts are: the Southern Regional Education Board, with fourteen southern states as members; the New England Board of Higher Education, with 6 northeastern states as members; and the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, with 13 members. These exchange programs in general allow state students to enroll in programs not offered in the student's home state but offered in another member state at resident tuition rates. Some states subsidize these exchanges with payments to the receiving states. Sometimes states, while maintaining competitive entrance requirements, will reserve some number of spaces in specialized programs for residents of other states (New England Board of Higher Education 1978; WICHE 1978; Southern Regional Education Board 1979).

Such exchange and reciprocal programs provide important examples of the kind of regional and interstate cooperation that can be accomplished given initiative and innovative spirit. These programs, with the exception of the direct reciprocal arrangements with states near Minnesota, tend to be small, often confined to graduate or professional programs, and with sometimes stringent controls concerning the numbers of students involved. They are not a major means of controlled migration of students from state to state; rather they represent limited examples of what might be possible on a larger scale, and they also provide models of bilateral state arrangements that can make cooperation among public colleges possible.

Conclusions

Interstate student migration can be seen as a disturbing trend toward increasing homogeneity in American society, as an indicator of success for post-war policies encouraging low-cost public postsecondary educational access and opportunity, and as a key element in developing more efficient use of higher education resources for individual and societal goals.

As a trend indicator student migration can provide campus-based educators with a window and a measure of the effectiveness of public policy toward higher education. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1976), Carbone (1974), Etzioni (1974), and MacDonald (1977) all argue a persuasive case for a greater emphasis on migration for the economic, educational, and vocational benefits that can be derived for individuals, institutions, and the society as a whole. Etzioni (1974) argues that "colleges are usually the first real chance, and often the last for a great societal mixer where persons of all backgrounds coming from different regions will get to know each other as persons and not as stereotypes."

In the absence of required military service, college attendance may well represent the largest single opportunity to provide these social benefits. Overall, however, exposure to the breadth and variety of our society as exemplified by college attendance within a geographically balanced student body can only be said to be decreasing.

This will not be an easy trend to reverse. Existing cooperative arrangements provide one method of encouraging migration, while increasing efficiency, and may prove expandable beyond existing arrangements (Callan 1978; Martorana and Nespoli 1978). The federal government could encourage additional migration by requiring portability of the funds provided to states for student aid programs; but without significant expansion in this program such portability requirements are not likely to have much effect on the vastly larger sums states currently devote to student aid efforts.

The issues of continued diversity in educational opportunity and the creation and importance of a national experience that transcends parochical interests are the most elemental concepts in this discussion of interstate migration. Diversity of experience and education has been noted as fostering and strengthening individual, institutional, and societal goals for higher education. Such diversity requires planning, creativity, and a willingness to deny local and state interests on scales not yet visable in the community of higher education. Models for the fostering of greater migration are available (Carbone 1974; Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching 1976; Breneman and Finn 1978). They remain largely unimplemented. As the 1980's begin, it is important to recognize the ideals and opportunities available to encourage student migration, even as economic and financial factors suggest continuation of current trends.

Bibliography

Bowen, Howard R. *Investment in Learning.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977.

Breneman, David and Finn, Chester E. Jr. (Eds.). *Public Policy and Private Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1978.

Bureau of the Census. Current Population Reports: (Series P-25, No. 796). *Illustrative Projections of State Populations by Age, Race and Sex: 1975 to 2000.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979.

Callan, Patrick M. *A State Higher Education Agency View of Planning and Review of Graduate Education.* Denver, Co. Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, 1978. HE 011 767. MF-$0.98; PC-$2.96. Feb. 1980 RIE.

California Coordinating Council for Higher Education. *The Nonresident Student.* Sacramento, CA: California Coordinating Council for

Henderson,, Cathy. *Changes in Enrollment by 1985.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, Policy Analysis Service Reports Vol. 3, No. 1, 1977. ED 140 766. MF-$0.98; PC-$2.96.

Jacobson, Robert L. "Lowering the Tuition Barrier on the Iowa-Nebraska Border," *Chronicle of Higher Education* 17, 22, February 13, 1979, pp. 13-14.

Laird, David B., Jr. Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Commission, 14 July 74. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for College and University Planning, Denver, Colorado, July 1974. ED 097 818. MF-$0.98; PC-$2.96.

MacDonald, Douglas S. *Alternative Tuition Systems.* AAHE/ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education Research Report No. 6. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1977. ED 146 827. MF-$0.98; PC-$7.77.

Magarrell, Jack. "Five Colleges Buck Trend Toward Tuition Increases, Announce Reductions." *Chronicle of Higher Education* 17 (November 27, 1978); 14.

Martorana, S.V. and Nespoli, Lawrence A., *Study, Talk and Action: A Report of a National Conference on Regionalism and Regionalization in American Postsecondary Education.* State College, PA: Center for the Study of Higher Education; The Pennsylvania State University, 1978. ED 165 602. MF-$0.98; PC-$4.27.

Mathis, Gilbert L. "Do Out-Of-State Students Pay Their Way?" *College Management* 7 (April 1972): 30-32.

Millard, Richard M. *The Future of Higher Education in the 1980's: Boom? Doom? Gloom? Bloom?* Paper presented at the 26th. Annual Meeting of State Higher Education Executive Officers. Denver, CO. Education Commission of the States, 1979. HE 011 853. (Feb. 1980 RIE.) MF-$0.98; PC-$2.96.

National Association of State Scholarship and Grant Programs. *9th Annual Survey 1977-78 Academic Year.* Deerfield, IL.: Illinois State Scholarship Commission, 1978.

National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. *1978-79 Student Charges at State and Land Grant Universities.* Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, 1978. ED 162 560. MF-$0.98; PC-$4.46.

New England Board of Higher Education. *New England Regional Student Program Enrollment Report 1978-79.* Wellesley, Mass: New England Board of Higher Education, 1979 (annual edition). HE 011 870. MF-$0.98; PC-$5.96.

Patrick, William S. "Regional Student Exchange Programs for Public Institutions of Higher Education." *College and University* 52 (Winter 1977); 216-30.

Peterson, Richard J. and Smith, Carolyn R. *Migration of College Students.* Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics,

Higher Education, 1970. ED 041 549. MF-$0.98; PC-$10.27.

Carbone, Robert F. *Alternative Tuition Systems.* Iowa City, IA: American College Testing Program, 1974. ED 100 227. MF-$0.98; PC-$12.58.

_____. *Students and State Borders. Fiscal/Legal Issues Affecting Nonresident Students.* Iowa City, IA: American College Testing Program, 1973. ED 082 678. MF-$0.98; PC-$5.96.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. *The States and Higher Education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1976.

Dearman, Nancy B. and Plisko, Valena White. *The Condition of Education.* 1979 Edition, Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1979.

Education Commission of the States. *Profiles of State Student Aid Programs.* Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States, 1977. ED 148 226. MF-$1.93; PC-$50.21. ED 148 227. MF-$2.08; PC-$56.57. ED 148 228. MF-$2.08; PC-$56.50

_____. *States and Student Financial Aid Issues.* Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States, forthcoming.

_____. "Summary of State Regulations and Relevant Legal Actions." *Higher Education and the States* 6, 3 (Special Issue I, 1978): 125-145. MF-$0.98; PC-$2.96.

_____. *Summary of State Student Financial Aid Programs.* Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States, 1977b.

Eiden, Leo J. "Statistic of the Month: Residence and Migration of College Students." *American Education* 13 (May 1977): 34.

Etzioni, Amitai. "Interstate Integration of Students." *The Educational Forum* 38 (1974). 223-4.

Fenske, R.H. *College Student Migration.* Iowa City, IA: American College Testing Program, 1972. ED 076 150. MF-$0.98; PC-$4.46.

Fenske, Robert H.; Scott, Craig S.; and Carmody, James F. "Recent Trends in Studies of Student Migration." *Journal of Higher Education* 45 (January 1974): 61-74.

Fife, Jonathan D. "The Independent Student and Student Aid Programs." ERIC/AAHE *Research Currents.* Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, (June 1976. ED 125 501. MF-$0.98; PC-$2.96.

Henderson, Cathy and Plummer, Janet C. *Adapting to the Chagnes in the Characteristics of College Age Youth.* Washington, D.C. American Council of Education, 1978. ED 162 594. MF-$0.98; PC-$4.46.

dents. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1976. ED 167 038. MF-$0.98; PC-not available from EDRS.

Rusk, James J. and Leslie, Larry L. "The Setting of Tuition in Public Higher Education." *The Journal of Higher Education* 49 (Nov.-Dec. 1978): 531-47.

Southern Regional Education Board. *The Academic Common Market.* Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board, 1979 (Annual Edition). HE 011 643. MF-$0.98; PC-$15.58.

Steahr, T.E. and Schmid, C.F. "College Student Migration in the United States." *Journal of Higher Education* 42 (1972): 441-63.

Wade, George H. *Residence and Migration of College Students: Fall 1968.* Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1970. ED 049 720. MF-$0.98; PC-not available from EDRS.

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. *A Study of Dental Graduates of the WICHE Student Exchange Programs Showing the Relation of that Group to Dental Manpower of the Sending States.* Boulder, CO: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1977. HE 011 872. MF-$0.98; PC-$4.46.

_____. *A Study of Medical Graduates of the WICHE Student Exchange of Programs Showing the Relation of that Group to the Medical Manpower of the Sending States.* Boulder, CO: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1978. HE 011 866. MF-$0.98; PC-$5.96.

To order documents in the bibliography by an ED number, write to ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), Computer Microfilm International Corporation, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, Va. 22210. Documents with HE numbers are presently being processed by EDRS and will be assigned ED numbers upon publication in Resources in Education (RIE). In ordering, ED numbers must be specified. MF indicates microfiche and PC denotes paper copy; payment must accompany orders of less than $10.00; and all orders must be in writing.